

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

Gregory A. Scher,

Civ. No. 19-2001 (SRN/BRT)

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

Bureau of Prisons; Capt. J. Fedas; Lt.
Bordt; and FMC Rochester,

Defendants.

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Gregory A. Scher's Request for an Enlargement of Time. (Doc. No. 76.) The Court interprets Plaintiff's request as a request for an extension to the October 1, 2020 deadlines for Plaintiff to respond to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 60), as well as the deadlines for Plaintiff's objections to the two pending Reports and Recommendations (Doc. Nos. 56, 57). Plaintiff requests a 30-day extension, citing circumstances related to his release from prison on September 24, 2020, COVID-19 restrictions, the need to obtain medical reports, and problems with his computer's power supply.

Based on the file, record and submissions herein, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

1. Plaintiff's request (**Doc. No. 76**) is **GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART:**

2. Plaintiff's response to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 60) is now due on or before **November 2, 2020**. This includes Plaintiff's rights, if any, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2)(B)¹; and

3. Plaintiff's objections to the two pending Reports and Recommendations (Doc. Nos. 56, 57) are now due on or before **November 2, 2020**.

4. Plaintiff's request that the Court "notify the Clerk to post this same pleading in each of the of the plaintiff's active cases in this district at the time to eliminate the need for duplicitous pleadings all of the same nature" is **DENIED**. Plaintiff is responsible for making the appropriate and permissible filings in his active cases.

Dated: October 7, 2020

s/ Becky R. Thorson
BECKY R. THORSON
United States Magistrate Judge

¹ The Court notes that Plaintiff also mentions an enlargement of time in which to plead. (Doc. No. 76.) While the deadlines for amending the Complaint set forth in the Scheduling Order have expired, the Court will liberally interpret Plaintiff's request to also encompass a request to extend the 21-day time period pursuant Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2)(B). In extending this time period, since the Court is unaware of how Plaintiff plans to respond to the Motion to Dismiss, the Court is not taking any position as to whether Rule 15 will apply to Plaintiff's response or whether any potential response by Plaintiff will otherwise invoke Rule 15.